

**REMARKS**

In response to the Official Action mailed November 27, 2006, Applicant submits the following amendments and remarks.

**CLAIM REJECTION 35 U.S.C. §103 - KAUFMANN**

Claims 5-7 and 9-13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) for being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 3,582,140 (the Kaufmann Patent). To make obvious, the reference must disclose teach or suggest all elements of the claim. The Kaufmann Patent fails to tech disclose or suggest "a brush having a shaft having. . . a locking hub disposed at said first end of said shaft, said hub being adapted to engage the power tool thereby locking the shaft to the power tool" as recited in amended claim 5. Since the Kaufmann Patent does not teach, disclose or suggest all elements of claim 5, the Kaufmann Patent does not make claim 5 obvious. Claims 6-7 and 9-13 depend from claim 5 either directly or indirectly and therefore are not obvious over the Kaufmann Patent for at least the same reasons as claim 5.

**CLAIM REJECTION 35 U.S.C. §103(a) - GLAS**

Claims 5-7, 9-10, 13 and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,165,362 (the Glas Patent). Similar to Kaufmann, Glas does not teach disclose or suggest "a brush having a shaft having. . . a locking hub disposed at said first end of said shaft, said hub being adapted to engage the power tool thereby locking the shaft to the power tool" as recited in amended claim 5. Rather the brush of *Glas* is for hand use and cannot be engaged to a mechanical tool. Since the Glas Patent does not

teach, disclose or suggest all elements of claim 5, the Glas Patent does not make claim 5 obvious. Claims 5-7, 9-10, 13 and 15-16 depend from claim 5 either directly or indirectly and therefore are not obvious over the Kaufmann Patent for at least the same reasons as claim 5.

**CLAIM REJECTION 35 U.S.C. §103 - MEYER**

Claims 5-7, 9-10 and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 2,633,592 (the Meyer Patent). Once again, as with Kaufmann and Glas, Meyer does not teach, disclose or suggest "a brush having a shaft having. . . a locking hub disposed at said first end of said shaft, said hub being adapted to engage the power tool thereby locking the shaft to the power tool" as recited in amended claim 5. The only mention of attaching the brush is where Meyer discloses that the brush is mounted at the end of a hollow tube 22 by means of a pin. The mounting in the Meyer Patent is on a hollow tube that may act as a handle or an extender and not a power tool as recited in claim 5. Since the Meyer Patent does not teach, disclose or suggest all elements of claim 5, the Meyer Patent does not make claim 5 obvious. Claims 5-7, 9-10 and 13-16 depend from claim 5 either directly or indirectly and therefore are not obvious over the Kaufmann Patent for at least the same reasons as claim 5.

**CLAIM REJECTION 35 U.S.C. §103(a) - WARNER**

Claims 5-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5, 599, 225 (the Warner Patent) to Warner, et al. Similar to Meyer, Glas and Kaufmann, Warner does not teach, disclose or suggest "a brush having a shaft having. . . a locking hub disposed at said first end of

said shaft, said hub being adapted to engage the power tool thereby locking the shaft to the power tool" as recited in amended claim 5. Since the Warner Patent does not teach, disclose or suggest all elements of claim 5, the Warner Patent does not make claim 5 obvious. Claims 6-11 depend from claim 5 either directly or indirectly and therefore are not obvious over the Kaufmann Patent for at least the same reasons as claim 5.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that she telephone Applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which she might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: May 25, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By Dixit Mayankkumar  
Mayankkumar M. Dixit  
Registration No.: 44,064  
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,  
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP  
600 South Avenue West  
Westfield, New Jersey 07090  
(908) 654-5000  
Attorney for Applicant